DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 476 688 JC 030 297

TITLE	Trident Technical College Summary of Assessment Results for 2001-2002.
INSTITUTION	Trident Technical Coll., Charleston, SC.
PUB DATE	2003-00-00
NOTE	10p.; Also called "2001-2002 Institutional Effectiveness Summary."
AVAILABLE FROM	For full text: http://www.tridenttech.edu/ir/IESummary20012002.htm.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Advising; Community Colleges; *Educational Indicators; General Education; *Institutional Evaluation; Outcomes of Education; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; School Effectiveness; Transfer Programs ; Two Year College Students; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Trident Technical College SC

ABSTRACT

This institutional effectiveness (IE) report for Trident Technical College (TTC), South Carolina, describes majors and concentrations, academic advisement, and transfer. The 2001-2002 academic year marked the tenth year of Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS) for the college. GAS is a systematic means of developing an individual yardstick for assessing the performance of individual programs and services. The GAS process allows individuals responsible for each program or service to identify performance indicators and levels of performance. Highlights of the report include the following: (1) the report assessed 19 majors, which include 10 associate degree programs, 8 certificate programs, and 1 diploma program; (2) the report found that 92% of summer 2002 enrollees were registered by their assigned advisor, while in spring 2002, 57% of enrollees registered during the early registration period--the goal is for all students assigned to an advisor to register during this early period in order to avoid the registration crunch; and (3) the fall 2001 transfer cohort consisted of 245 students, a 53% increase over the fall 1999 cohort of 160 students. Transfer students' fall 2001 average grade point average at all institutions was 2.45, compared with native students' average GPA at all institutions of 2.72. (NB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 476 688

TRIDENT TECHNICAL COLLEGE SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS FOR 2001-2002

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Myers

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

SC 030 297

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TRIDENT TECHNICAL COLLEGE
SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS
FOR 2001-2002

Trident Technical College's vision is to be a leader among two-year colleges in providing diverse and innovative educational programs and services in a highly technical and competitive global environment. College policy 2-18-0 titled Vision Statement, Mission Statement, Institutional Values, Institutional Goals and Objectives refers to the college's commitment to technical and comprehensive education to enhance economic development. The Policies and Procedures can be found at http://www.tridenttech.edu/ttcpolicies/Section2/visionmissiongoals.htm

This summary report for Trident Technical College includes the following Institutional Effectiveness components: Majors and Concentrations, Academic Advising, and Transfer.

METHODOLOGY. The 2001 – 2002 Institutional Effectiveness (IE) activity marked the tenth year of Goal Attainment Scaling (GAS). The GAS, a flexible measurement process, is a systematic means of developing an individual yardstick for assessing the performance of individual programs and services. The GAS process allows individuals responsible for each program or service to identify performance indicators and levels of performance to measure the degree of each effectiveness indicator.

FUTURE REPORTS (2002-2005). The following table presents the reporting dates for assessing Institutional Effectiveness Components from 2002 through 2006.

Institutional Effectiveness Components	2003	2004	2005	2006
General Education		X		
Majors and Concentrations	X	X	X	X
Academic Advising		X		X
2-year to 4-year Transfer		X		X
Student Development	X	X	X	X
Library Resources	X			X
Total Components	3	3	4	5

The following section presents a brief summary of each program and service assessed in 2001 – 2002 and projected reporting dates for those components not reported this year.

GENERAL EDUCATION. This component will be assessed in 2004.

MAJORS AND CONCENTRATIONS. Nineteen majors were identified for

TC3297

assessment during 2001 – 2002. They include ten Associate Degree programs, eight Certificate programs and one Diploma program. The Associate Degree programs are: Associate in Science; Medical Lab Technology; Physical Therapist Assistant; Office Systems Technology; General Technology Engineering Graphics Design; General Technology Environmental Technology; General Technology Industrial Electricity and Electronics; Culinary Arts; Aircraft Maintenance Technology; and Civil Engineering Technology. The Certificates assessed are: Child Care Management; Early Childhood; Infant and Toddler Development; School-Age Child Care; Film Design; Film Equipment; Filmmaking; and Film Production. The diploma program is Early Childhood Development.

Managers and faculty of each instructional program identified effectiveness indicators and expected levels of performance (benchmarks) for each program. Across the programs, the most common effectiveness indicators include fall enrollment, number of graduates, job placement rates, employer satisfaction, graduate satisfaction with job preparation, student satisfaction with courses and instructors, and Fall to spring retention. Managers and faculty are also interested in student success in specified courses, and employers' satisfaction with graduates' technical skills. Some managers developed indicators unique to instructional programs such as percent minority and female enrollment, percent of students who graduate within specific time periods, student to equipment ratios, and instructional space compared to enrollment.

In all cases assessment includes examination of whether or not specified benchmarks are met. All programs assessed met or exceeded the benchmarks specified for the majority of their performance indicators. The Associate in Science assessment is not complete due to the complex indicators and difficulties encountered in retrieving the necessary data from Colleague. The following programs met or exceeded all benchmarks: Culinary Arts, Medical Lab Technology, Physical Therapy Assistant, and School-Age Child Care. Four programs failed to meet one indicator and four programs failed to meet two indicators. One program failed to meet three indicators. Those indicators for which benchmarks were not met are fall enrollment, number of graduates, job placement, course success rates, average SECI full-time instructor score, and availability of lab equipment.

Program managers designed improvement plans for those indicators where benchmarks were not met. The strategies are described by indicator.

Fall Enrollment

- Continue recruiting activities in local high schools to encourage students to consider TTC upon graduation.

Number of Graduates

- Determine whether or not course scheduling has an effect upon when students graduate.

- Interact with students to identify problems that may deter students from graduating.

- Counsel at risk second semester Transfer students; encourage them to complete Trident's Civil Engineering Technology program.

Job Placement

- Faculty and other college employees will seek methods of identifying local industrial needs and ensuring that academic programs are designed to produce students who meet those needs.

- Invite local employers to become members of Advisory Committees, teach them about our programs and encourage them to hire our graduates.

- Visit employers of Civil Engineering Technology students and encourage them to urge the student/employees to complete the program.

Course Success Rates

- Identify the major problems encountered by students enrolled in those courses with low success rates. Develop strategies to improve the courses and the success rates.

Average SECI full-time Instructor Score

- Work with instructors to plan strategies for improving specific teaching weaknesses.

Availability of Lab Equipment

- Seek capital equipment funds to purchase equipment for labs.

ACADEMIC ADVISING.

The mission of Academic Advising is to help students meet their educational goals. This includes the following objectives:

- To provide information about a curriculum, including scheduling options and limitations.
- To place students appropriately in courses based on their needs.
- To aid in planning, sequencing, and scheduling classes for the student's curriculum.
- To help the student identify his or her strengths and weaknesses, and reformulate academic and career goals as necessary.
- To foster realistic academic expectations in the student.

- To make advising available to the student.
- To provide the student with sources of help and information as needed.
- To register students for courses.

In 2000, Trident Technical College began transition to an entirely new computer system for all data, including student information (admissions, transcripts and other records, and especially registration). The first registration of students was in the summer of 2001 for the Fall 2001 term.

After the initial transition period, the Advising Committee began meeting to identify advising issues and collect and disseminate information related to advising, as well as to update the Advisor Handbook. The Advising Coordinator converted the handbook to a website that can be (and is) updated on a continual basis. This has eliminated the need for paper updates to be constantly generated and distributed. Although this reference and the new computer system in general are indeed improvements over the old versions, they are not always realized as improvements because of the resistance that naturally goes along with any change in procedure. As advisors become more accustomed to and proficient in these new procedures, the entire Academic Advising process should significantly improve.

Data for measuring student satisfaction was collected via telemarketers during July 2002. Data for measuring advisor and staff satisfaction was collected via an online survey during May 2002. The 2001 Graduate Follow-up survey provided data for the satisfaction of graduates.

One important measure is the percentage of students who were registered specifically by their assigned advisor (92% of Summer 2002 enrollees were registered this way sometime in the previous year) and the percentage of students who were registered during "Early Registration" (now known as "Priority Registration"). Only 57% of Spring 2002 enrollees registered during the preferred "Early Registration" period. The goal is for all students assigned an advisor to register during that "priority" period, thus alleviating the registration crunch just before classes begin. The percentage of students who claimed to have been registered by their assigned advisors (92%) is very impressive and should continue. But the low percentage of students registered during the preferred timeframe is an area of academic advising that needs improvement.

A significant problem is the period between "Priority Registration" and "Registration" (formerly known as "Open Registration"). The published information states that students need to register during Priority Registration or wait until the Registration day just before classes begin. But in practice, many advisors and staff members can and do register students in between these periods. This alleviates overcrowding either at the end of Priority Registration or on Registration day.

Other areas of academic advising that show need for improvement are student satisfaction, advisor satisfaction, staff satisfaction, and graduate satisfaction. Advisors need to pay special attention to helping each student design an educational plan,

expressing interest in each student, and to referring students to other sources of help. The advisor satisfaction indicators reflect the fact that advisors have been very unhappy with the entire process during the last two years. Once the new system is not so new, continues to process data at an acceptable speed, and has the features up and running that make it superior to the old system, this area should automatically see improvement. But students need to be learn to be on time, bring necessary materials, and take an active role in the process.

In comparison with the last IE assessment, it appears that student satisfaction has decreased, especially in the above mentioned categories. However, the data from the last assessment was really not statistically valid. Advisor satisfaction was not measured last time, so it is not evident whether the low levels are a new or continuing problem. The percentage of students registered by their assigned advisor has seen a dramatic increase (though here the current data is not as reliable as the past data, since it is based on student response instead of system tracking).

ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS TRANSFERRING FROM TWO- TO FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS.

TTC gauges transfer activity and performance of students transferring from Trident to senior colleges by comparing: the size of transfer cohorts across time; the number of students transferring to senior colleges; and each cohort's average GPA (for the fall term of transfer) with that of native students. The college also analyzes senior institutions' rejection rates for applicants from Trident Technical College.

Cohort Size. The Fall 2001 transfer cohort (those who actually enrolled and completed the Fall 2001 term at a Senior institution) consists of 245 students, a 53% increase over the Fall 1999 cohort of 160 students.

Receiving Institutions. The Fall 1996 data included MUSC data indicating that 25% of the cohort transferred to MUSC. In fact, 85% of the Fall 1996 cohort transferred to the Citadel (7%), College of Charleston (53%), or MUSC (25%). Unfortunately, there are no MUSC data for the Fall 1999 or the Fall 2001 cohort. The proportion of the Fall 2001 cohort transfers to the Citadel (8%) and to the College of Charleston (61%) is less than in 1999. In 1999 87% of the cohort transferred to the Citadel and College of Charleston compared to 69% of the Fall 2001 cohort.

Fall Term GPAs. The comparison of the 2001 Transfer Cohort's GPAs with native students' GPAs from each senior college requires a different analysis than in the past. Until 1999 the data received from the senior colleges allowed analysis of each student's performance. As in 1999, the 2001 data provide an average GPA for those students who transferred and completed 0 to 29 hours, 30 to 59 hours, or 60 or more hours. Analysis of individual student performance is not possible. For instance The Citadel reported four white males as having transferred and completed 30 to 59 hours. Their average GPA is 1.89. There is no way to determine whether or not one or more of the three performed as well as the 323 native students whose average GPA is 2.67. In fact, the 2001 transfer

data limits analysis.

The available data does allow a comparison of average GPAs across the three categories of credit hours transferred and earned. Table 1 indicates students transferring to The Citadel, Clemson, College of Charleston, Lander and South Carolina State established an average GPA at or above 2.00. It also indicates that two Coastal Carolina - Trident students' average is one and a third grade points below the average GPA of 266 Coastal Carolina native students while two Lander – Trident students' average is one and a third grade points above the average GPA of 1077 Lander native students.

TABLE 1

Senior College	Trident Technical College Transfer Students' Fall 2001 Average GPA		Senior Institution First Time Native Students' Fall 2001 Average GPA		Difference in GPA Senior Native minus Trident Transfer
	Students	*AVG. GPA*	*Students*	*AVG. GPA*	
The Citadel	19	2.80	1794	2.77	.03
Clemson	11	2.12	1652	2.83	(.71)
College of Charleston	149	2.62	6546	2.81	(.19)
Coastal Carolina	6	2.84	1107	2.73	.11
Francis Marion	6	1.38	1718	2.62	(1.24)
Lander	4	2.68	1116	2.53	.15
South Carolina State	9	2.45	2461	2.46	(.01)
USC – Aiken	3	2.98	1210	2.71	.27
USC – Columbia	17	2.67	7322	2.93	(.27)
USC – Spartanburg	13	2.21	652	2.83	(.62)
Winthrop	8	2.23	3398	2.76	(.53)
Total	245	2.45	43846	2.72	(.27)

Table 1 indicates students transferring to The Citadel, Clemson, College of Charleston, Coastal Carolina, Lander, South Carolina State, USC – Aiken, UAC – Columbia, USC Spartanburg and Winthrop established an average GPA at or above 2.00. Trident Transfer students' average GPA was higher than native students GPAs at The Citadel, Coastal Carolina, Lander, and USC – Aiken. With the exception of Francis Marion, the differences between Trident Transfer students and Native students appear to be miniscule.

The range of Trident Transfer students' average GPA is 1.38 to 2.98 compared to the Native students' average GPA range of 2.46 to 2.93. The majority of Trident Transfer students (with the exception of those attending Francis Marion) appear to perform as well

as the Senior College Native students although no tests of significance were performed.

The following table presents a comparison of rejection rates of applicants from Trident in 1999 and 2001. It also compares Trident's 2001 rejection rates with 2001 system wide technical college rejection rates.

TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF REJECTION RATES OF APPLICANTS FROM TRIDENT WITH APPLICANTS FROM ALL TECHNICAL COLLEGES 1999 and2001								
Senior College Receiving Applications	**Trident 1999 Applicants Rejection Rates**		**Trident 2001 Applicants Rejection Rates**		**Trident Percent Difference 1999-2001**	**Technical System Applicants Rejection Rates 1999**		**Percent Difference Trident – Technical System 1999**
	Student Apps	*Percent Reject*	*Student Apps*	*Percent Reject*		*Student Apps*	*Percent Reject*	*Trident 2001 Minus Tech. Sys. 2001*
The Citadel	27	11%	38	13%	+2%	63	21%	8% lower
Clemson	25	40%	31	26%	-14%	441	31%	5% lower
College of Charleston	172	32%	269	15%	-17%	396	15%	Same
Coastal Carolina	3	0	7	14%	+14%	227	5%	9% higher
Francis Marion	3	67%	14	14%	-53%	196	13%	1% higher
Lander	0	0%	12	0%	0%	239	2%	2% lower
South Carolina State	6	0%	21	5%	+5%	182	4%	1% higher
USC Aiken	1	0%	8	13%	+13%	353	15%	2% lower
USC Columbia	66	32%	202	17%	-15%	2090	15%	2% higher
USC Spartanburg	4	25%	20	5%	-20%	793	5%	Same
Winthrop	10	10%	13	8%	-2%	210	8%	Same
Total	317	29%	635	15%	-14%	5190	13%	2% higher

Rejection Rates. Six hundred thirty-five Trident students applied for transfer in 2001. Of the 635 applications, 195 (31%) were incomplete, thus the senior colleges did not consider the applicants. Ninety-six (15%) were rejected. Lander did not reject any Trident applicants in Fall 2001 and rejection rates for Clemson, College of Charleston, Francis

Marion, USC – Columbia, USC – Spartanburg and Winthrop decreased since 1999. However, in 2001 The Citadel, College of Charleston, South Carolina State, and USC – Aiken, rejected a larger proportion of Trident students.

Unfortunately, the lack of detail in transfer data limits further analysis. The results of this analysis offer little or no direction for designing improvement strategies.

LIBRARY RESOURCES. This component will be assessed in 2003.

STUDENT DEVELOPMENT. This component will be assessed in 2003.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

NOTICE

Reproduction Basis

[X] This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.

[ ] This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").